



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

B

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,382	09/15/2003	Joerg Beringer	09282.0013-00000	1611
22852	7590	03/30/2007	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			NGUYEN, VAN KIM T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/30/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,382	BERINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Van Kim T. Nguyen	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date February 9, 2004.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communications filed on September 15, 2003.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8 and 16 recite the negative limitation “without saving the work performed in the execution level page ...” in lines 3, which render the claims indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rojewski et al (US 7,139,978), hereinafter Rojewski.

Regarding claim 1, as shown in Figures 1-5, Rojewski discloses a method comprising: in a portal, presenting a control level page in a first browser session (e.g., first browser 120 requires transmission for exchanging data between the client computer 115 and the server 125, i.e., to read or write data from data store 140. The second browser 145 is in a “listening mode” in relation to first browser 120; col. 4: line 65 – col. 5: line 15 and col. 9: lines 30-39); and

presenting an execution level page in a second browser session while maintaining the first browser session (e.g., second browser 145 periodically polls the data store 140 for data items not previously retrieve by the second browser 145; col. 9: lines 40-57).

Regarding claim 2, Rojewski also discloses the control level page includes messages and work triggers (e.g., name, billing address; and tabbing between data fields and/or jumping to new screens; col. 8: lines 21-40).

Regarding claim 3, Rojewski also discloses the control level page includes trackable work objects (e.g., user interaction such as e-commerce transaction is represented by an object-event pair; col. 6: lines 8-64, and col. 8: lines 41-57).

Regarding claim 4, Rojewski also discloses the control level page includes links to services and objects in an execution level page (e.g., a user might access a search engine (a first application), use the search engine to locate a website for a vendor, locate a link to point the browser to the vendor’s website (a second application), and perform an e-commerce transaction

with the vendor; col. 8: lines 41-57).

Regarding claim 5, Rojewski also discloses the services and objects correspond to a user's workset (e.g., user interaction such as e-commerce transaction is represented by an object-event pair; col. 6: lines 8-64, and col. 8: lines 41-57).

Regarding claim 6, Rojewski also discloses the control level page includes a user's personal files and contacts (e.g., name, billing address, etc.; col. 8: lines 21-40).

Regarding claim 7, Rojewski also discloses the control level page includes links to one or more workset areas (e.g., a user might access a search engine (a first application), use the search engine to locate a website for a vendor, locate a link to point the browser to the vendor's website (a second application), and perform an e-commerce transaction with the vendor; col. 8: lines 41-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rojewski, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Kobayaghi et al (US 6,950,852), hereinafter Kobayaghi.

Rojewski discloses substantially all the claimed limitations, except receiving work performed on the execution level page; navigating to the control level page without saving the work performed in the execution level page; and navigating back to the execution level page, the execution level page preserving the work performed before navigating to the control level page.

Kobayaghi discloses receiving work performed on the execution level page; navigating to the control level page without saving the work performed in the execution level page; and navigating back to the execution level page, the execution level page preserving the work performed before navigating to the control level page (e.g., web browser 1 and web browser 2 detects changes and remotely exchanges information without saving the work; col. 2: lines 33-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kobayaghi's method of sharing browsers in Rojewski's system, in order to provide users with a browser sharing system without the burden of installation and requires little data traffic for synchronization.

8. Claims 9-16 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rojewski, in view of Kobayaghi.

Regarding claim 9, as shown in Figures 1-5, Rojewski discloses a method comprising: in a portal, presenting a control level page in a first browser session (e.g., first browser 120 requires transmission for exchanging data between the client computer 115 and the server 125, i.e., to read or write data from data store 140. The second browser 145 is in a "listening

mode" in relation to first browser 120; col. 4: line 65 – col. 5: line 15 and col. 9: lines 30-39); and

presenting an execution level page in a second browser session while maintaining the first browser session (e.g., second browser 145 periodically polls the data store 140 for data items not previously retrieve by the second browser 145; col. 9: lines 40-57).

However, Rojewski does not explicitly call for a cross functional application to provide communication between at least one of an object modeling tool, a process modeling tool, and a user interface tool.

As shown in Figure 2, Kobayaghi teaches a cross functional application to provide communication between at least one of an object modeling tool (e.g., web server), a process modeling tool (e.g., collaboration server), and a user interface tool (e.g., browser; col. 2: line 33 – col. 4: line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kobayaghi's cross functional application in Rojewski's system, motivated by the need to manipulate and share web pages.

Regarding claim 10, Rojewski-Kobayaghi also discloses the control level page includes messages and work triggers (e.g., name, billing address; and tabbing between data fields and/or jumping to new screens; Rojewski, col. 8: lines 21-40).

Regarding claim 11, Rojewski-Kobayaghi also discloses the control level page includes trackable work objects (e.g., user interaction such as e-commerce transaction is represented by an

object-event pair; Rojewski, col. 6: lines 8-64, and col. 8: lines 41-57).

Regarding claim 12, Rojewski-Kobayaghi also discloses the control level page includes links to services and objects in an execution level page (e.g., a user might access a search engine (a first application), use the search engine to locate a website for a vendor, locate a link to point the browser to the vendor's website (a second application), and perform an e-commerce transaction with the vendor; Rojewski, col. 8: lines 41-57).

Regarding claim 13, Rojewski-Kobayaghi also discloses the services and objects correspond to a user's workset (e.g., user interaction such as e-commerce transaction is represented by an object-event pair; Rojewski, col. 6: lines 8-64, and col. 8: lines 41-57).

Regarding claim 14, Rojewski-Kobayaghi also discloses the control level page includes a user's personal files and contacts (e.g., name, billing address, etc.; Rojewski, col. 8: lines 21-40).

Regarding claim 15, Rojewski-Kobayaghi also discloses the control level page includes links to one or more workset areas (e.g., a user might access a search engine (a first application), use the search engine to locate a website for a vendor, locate a link to point the browser to the vendor's website (a second application), and perform an e-commerce transaction with the vendor; Rojewski, col. 8: lines 41-57).

Regarding claim 16, Rojewski-Kobayaghi also discloses receiving work performed on the execution level page; navigating to the control level page without saving the work performed in the execution level page; and navigating back to the execution level page, the execution level page preserving the work performed before navigating to the control level page (e.g., web browser 1 and web browser 2 detects changes and remotely exchanges information without saving the work; Kobayaghi, col. 2: lines 33-37).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Cleasby et al (US 7,003,550), Methods and Apparatus for Establishing Collaboration using Browser State Information;

Ohkado et al (US 6,912,573), Method for Acquiring Content Information, and Software Product, Collaboration System and Collaboration Server for Acquiring Content Information;

Jellum et al (US 6,915,482), Method and Arrangement for Web Information Monitoring;

Johnson (US 6,871,197), Method and Mechanism for a Web Based Knowledge

Management Tool;

Rust (US 6,668,273), System and Method for Application Viewing Through
Collaborative Web Browsing Session; and

Furst (US 6,297,819), Parallel Web Site.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Van Kim T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2151

Application/Control Number: 10/663,382
Art Unit: 2151

Page 10

vkn

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Bunjob" on the left and the last name "Jaroenchonwanit" on the right, ending with a small upward flourish.

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER